A

DISCOURSE

Concerning the

Worship of Images.

Preached before the

UNIVERSITY

OF

OXFORD,

On the 24*th* of *May*, 1686.

By *GEORGE TVLLIE* Sub-Dean of *York*, &c.
For which he was Suſpended.

IMPRIMATUR,

Apr. 7. 1689. *Z. Ibam* R. P. D. *Henrico* Epiſc. *Lond.* à Sacris.

LONDON:

Printed for **Ric. Chiſwell** at the *Roſe* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's Church Yard.* MDCLXXXIX.

To the Right Honourable, and Right Reverend Father in God, *HENRY* Lord Biſhop of *London*, one of his Majeſties moſt Honourable Privy Council.

My LORD,

SInce the true Reaſons of Puniſhments inflicted upon ſuch private and obſcure Perſons, as my ſelf, are many times not rightly underſtood by ſome, and miſrepreſented by others, and thereby leave a Stain behind them, and that this I found was my Caſe, at the time of my Suſpenſion; I thought I ſhould be wanting to my ſelf, if at this Juncture, (when, God be thank'd, an honeſt Zeal againſt Popery is no longer Criminal) I did not publiſh that Sermon, which brought the Rage of the Papiſts, and a Suſpenſion upon me. My Lord, *'tis not from any Opinion I have of the Performance it ſelf, that I now make it publick; for I am too well acquainted with the excellent Tracts which the Divines of our Church have publiſh'd, as upon others, ſo likewiſe upon this Argument, ſince the time of my preaching this Sermon, to entertain any ſuch fooliſh conceit of it; Nor ſhall I here take occaſion to reflect upon that venerable Body, the Dean and Chapter of* York,

who were pleas'd, immediately upon the receit of a Letter from the King, to Suspend me there for this Discourse preach'd before the University of Oxford; *and that without as much as the least Summons, Citation, or ordinary Civility of a private Letter to acquaint me with their Summary proceedings against me, tho 'twas visible enough, that as the management of their Censure was unprecedented, and then a leading Case; so had it not been without fatal Effects upon the Clergy, had not your Lordship, in a most generous and heroick Manner, put a stop to it here in the very same Case of the Reverend the Dean of* Norwich. My Lord, *as I had the Honour (for such even then I esteem'd it) to be the first Clergy-Man in* England *who suffer'd in those days in the Defence of our Religion against Popish Superstition and Idolatry; So I humbly beg, that your Lordship's being shortly after made the greatest and most eminent Instance of Suffering in the same excellent Cause, may excuse the Presumption of this Dedication, in*

My LORD,

Your Lordships most Obedient

and Devoted Servant

GEO. TULLIE.

EXOD. XX. *ver.* 4, and part of *ver.* 5.

Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image, nor the likeneſs of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth.

Thou ſhalt not bow down to them, nor worſhip them.

THeſe Words being an expreſs Law or Command, of a Moral, and therefore perpetual, Obligation, enforc'd upon us, above any of the other, not only with the particular *Reaſon* of it, The Jealouſy of that Great God in Relation to his Honour, who himſelf promulg'd it; but likewiſe, with a moſt ſevere and terrible *Sanction*, of viſiting this *great Iniquity*, as the Breach of it ſeems peculiarly to be ſtiled, unto the third and fourth Generation; and laſtly, with the moſt ample *Reward*, of ſhewing Mercy unto thouſands of them that keep it; (who ſeem here to be ſaid by way of Eminency, to *Love* God, as they, who violate the Command, to *Hate* him;) It concerns, doubtleſs, the Chriſtian as highly as ever it did the Jewiſh Church, to enquire into the true Senſe and import of that Law, which God himſelf has bound ſo faſt upon us; leſt ſome of us Chriſtians alſo, whilſt we trifle and diſtinguiſh to palliate an unwarrantable Practice in the Church, become *Idolaters, as were ſome of them.* My preſent buſineſs therefore ſhall be,

I. To aſſert and explain the genuine Senſe and Meaning of this Commandment.

II. To

II. To enquire into the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome*, in relation to this way of Worſhip.

III. To conſider, how they juſtify themſelves from the Imputation conſequent upon it.

And this with what brevity the Copiouſneſs of the Argument, and with what plainneſs the Nature of it will admit.

And firſt, I am to aſſert and explain the genuine Senſe and Meaning of this Commandment.

In order to the diſtinct underſtanding whereof, I find it abſolutely requiſite; Firſt, To remove thoſe falſe Gloſſes and Conſtructions which the Sophiſtry of ſome Men have put upon it, which, if left untouched, would darken and perplex the otherwiſe moſt evident Proofs of its true Senſe and Import.

Now that Expoſition which reſtrains the *Images* and *Similitudes*, mention'd in this Command, to the Repreſentations of *falſe* and *fictitious* Gods; and the worſhip prohibited, to the worſhipping them *for Gods*, being the moſt uſual amongſt our Adverſaries, and the likeſt to ſtand in our Light; we had beſt, I think, for brevity's ſake, confine our ſelves to the conſideration of that, and ſhew,

1*ſt*, That they have no reaſonable Colour for *reſtraining* the *Images* here ſpoken of, to the Repreſentations of *falſe* Gods. And that

2*dly*, Neither *Gentile* nor *Jewiſh* Idolaters did ever worſhip ſuch Repreſentations *for* Gods; and conſequently, ſuch worſhip could never be intended in this Prohibition before us.

Firſt, That our Adverſaries have no reaſonable Colour for reſtraining the Images here mention'd, to the Repreſentations of *falſe* Gods only.

And here one would have expected ſome ſhrewd Authority, and convincing Reaſon for ſo ſtraitlac'd a Conſtruction of a moſt plain, full, and comprehenſive Law; and

and yet, after all, the burden of the Argument miſerably ends in the pretended Signification of the *Greek* Word, εἴδωλον, by which it ſeems the Seventy had the good luck to Tranſlate the *Hebrew* word *Peſel*, in their verſion of this Law. And thus behold a pure Logomachy or Striſe of words made the chief Foundation of an aukward Senſe of ſo expreſs, ſo important a Commandment; a jejune and inſipid ſort of Conteſt This, I confeſs; but the miſery is, a Defendant is obliged to follow a litigious Plaintiff into what Court ſoever he thinks fit to remove his Cauſe. And here, tho one would think 'twere every whit as reaſonable to have recourſe to the import of an original Word for the Senſe of a Law, as to a Verſion of it; a word moſt properly ſignificative of any thing carv'd or engraven; a word render'd by the ſame Seventy almoſt conſtantly in that large Senſe, by the *Chaldee* and *Syriac* Interpreters of the place *Image*; by *Jerome*, and other *Latin* Tranſlators, *Idolum*, *Sculptile*, and *Imago* indifferently; by their own dear Vulgar Latin, *Sculptile*, in this very place; yet, to throw them all this in for quietneſs ſake, how comes *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, a great Critick, as well as a Divine, reciting this Law, to uſe the words, γλυπτὸν, χαρακτὸν, and πλαστὸν, inſtead of this ſo highly ſignificant word εἴδωλον? Nay, what is more ſtrange, How comes not only he, in his *Protreptick*; but *Origen* in his fourth Book againſt *Celſus*, and *Juſtin Martyr* in his Dialogue with *Trypho* the *Jew*, utterly to omit the word in their Citations of this Law, uſing only εἰκὼν and ὁμοίωμα? Of ſo little peculiar importance, did they think it; and yet am I apt to believe, they underſtood the Senſe of the Command, and the Signification of Words in their own Language, as well as the niceſt Critick now a days, without any offence to them. Nay, ſo far is this word from only denoting the Repreſentation of a falſe God, that, on the contrary, there's nothing more certain, than that any Image or Figure, *deſign'd*

ſign'd to worſhip the true God by, actually does, and properly may, come under the ſame Denomination. Thus St. *Stephen* calls the Golden Calf, an *Idol*, (*Acts* 7.41.) and yet it was only a Symbolical Repreſentation of the Great God, *Jehovah*, as we ſhall ſee hereafter. Thus, again, their own celebrated vulgar Verſion, unluckily ſtiles the Image that *Micah*'s Mother made, *Idolum*; and yet this was wholly dedicated unto the Lord, ſays the Text, (*Judges* 17.3.) And what in fine, is more evident, than that the Fathers, who branded the *Carpocratian* Hereticks with the Imputation of *Idolatry*, for worſhipping the Images of *Chriſt*; and the *Arrians* likewiſe, for worſhipping *Chriſt* himſelf, whileſt they thought him but a Creature; (ſtiling even our bleſſed Lord an *Idol* to them, who Worſhip'd him under that Notion.) What, I ſay, is more evident, than that they look'd on every thing as an *Idol* that was worſhipped, beſides the only true God; and ſuch Worſhippers, Idolaters: and conſequently, muſt have underſtood the word *Idol*, to have imported a great deal more than the Repreſentation of a falſe or fictitious God. But ſhould we let all this go for nothing, (as perhaps it would be thought hard to differ for a Word) yet cannot any reaſonable Man imagine why the other word *Temunah*, mention'd in the Law; a word moſt amply expreſſive of *any manner of Similitude whatſoever*, and by which the Divine Wiſdom ſeems moſt induſtriouſly to have provided againſt all poſſible Evaſions; Why this, I ſay, ſhould be either ſupinely ſlur'd over, or moſt boldly and unwarrantably confined to the narrow, and that falſely ſuppos'd, Signification of the former word εἰδωλον. For, to ſay no more, is it not more ſuitable to the received Notions of Mankind in this particular, to interpret a precedent by a ſubſequent word, rather than a ſubſequent word by a precedent; a ſubſequent word, eſpecially, of a moſt comprehenſive Signification, by a precedent of a very narrow and confined one? As I would

would only deſire to know of theſe Perſons, that if the Head of their Church ſhould publiſh a Bull, prohibiting Papal Honours, ſuch as being plac'd upon the Altar after Election, to be given to falſe Popes (as we know there have been ſeveral Pretenders to the infallible Chair at the ſame time) and not only to them, but to any Perſon elſe whatſoever: I would only know, I ſay, whether or no, he who ſhould explain the ſubſequent Terms of *any Perſon whatſoever*, by the precedent, the Pſeudo-Pretenders to the Popedom, and ſay, that the one meant no more than the other, would not be thought guilty of a very ſawcy and wilful Miſconſtruction of his Holineſs's pleaſure in the matter; and if he would, I deſire them to make the Application.

And thus I have ſhown, That they have no reaſonable Colour for *reſtraining* the Images and Similitudes mention'd in this Commandment, to the Repreſentations of *falſe* Gods.

I proceed in the ſecond Place, to ſhew, That neither did the old Idolaters ever worſhip ſuch Repreſentations for Gods; and that conſequently, the Prohibition of ſuch Worſhip could never be the Intention of this Commandment. This indeed is an Interpretation one might poſſibly have expected from the Pen of a Jeſuit, or other private everlaſting Caviller of that Church; but it is a ſhame, methinks, to find ſuch wretched Stuff in ſo authentick a Record, as the Catechiſm *ad Paroch.*

For firſt, all *falſe Objects* of Worſhip, (and ſuch muſt be all Images worſhipped for Gods) are manifeſtly prohibited in the firſt Commandment, [or, if they will have it ſo, in the firſt Part, or Clauſe of it,] *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but me*, i. e. thou ſhalt worſhip nothing but me; and therefore cannot be ſuppos'd to be again prohibited under that Notion in the ſecond Commandment, or but Appendix to the firſt; unleſs they will ſuppoſe the infinite Wiſ-

dom guilty of Impertinence, rather than themſelves. And indeed, would not any indifferent Man be apt to think them hard put to't for a *Salvo* to their own Practice, when they are forc'd to ſuppoſe the All-wiſe Lawgiver to have ſpent ſo many Words, in a ſhort Comprehenſion of Laws, upon the Prohibition of that which 'tis next to Impoſſible, in the very nature of the thing, any Man in his Wits ſhould ever be guilty of? For is it indeed, as much as fairly ſuppoſeable, that any thing in the ſhape of a reaſonable Creature ſhould take the Image, *i. e.* the *Likeneſs* or *Repreſentation of a thing*, *for the thing it ſelf*; take it for a Repreſentation, and not for a Repreſentation at the ſame time? I know not, I confeſs, what they may think credible, who can roundly take a Sign for the thing ſignified; but other People, who are not ſo much us'd to Contradictions, will not perhaps ſo eaſily digeſt the belief of it. If then they cannot reaſonably be preſum'd to have taken the Likeneſs of a God, for the very God himſelf whoſe it was, they could not worſhip it for ſuch; and conſequently, God could not here prohibit the worſhip of Images for Gods; which was the Point to be prov'd. And of which incidentally, more hereafter.

Having thus clear'd the way, by a ſhort removal of the chief part of that Dirt and Rubbiſh, which obſtructed our Paſſage; we may now go a little more cleanly and directly on, to the true Senſe and Import of this Commandment, which we aſſert to be this, That we are hereby forbid to worſhip the true God by all corporeal Figures and Repreſentations.

For, as in the firſt Commandment God has determin'd himſelf to be the only proper *Object* of Worſhip in Oppoſition to all falſe Objects of it, which the groſſer Heathens might Figure to themſelves; ſo, here in the Law before us, he prohibits that corrupt *way* or *manner*, whereby the more intelligent Heathens, at leaſt, and amongſt the reſt, the

the *Egyptians*, (whoſe Rites and Cuſtoms his own People might now be apt to retain) did actually worſhip him, declaring it altogether not only repugnant to his *Will*, the ſole *Rule* and *Standard*, but likewiſe incongruous to his *Nature*, the *Ground* and *Reaſon* of his Worſhip; of both which they being to have more ample Diſcoveries than the Nations had from amongſt whom he had brought them, would conſequently lay under ſtricter Obligations of not offending in this particular; which they perhaps would do well to conſider, who living under infinitely clearer Revelations of the Divine Will and Nature, than ever the *Jews* themſelves could pretend to, retain yet the worſhip here forbid, ſo manifeſtly repugnant to the expreſs Declaration of his Will, and the Majeſty of his Nature.

But to be a little more diſtinct, I ſhall endeavour to make out this Senſe of the Commandment.

1. From the Notion of Image-worſhip, as practic'd by the Heathens. And

2. From thoſe Reaſons, by which the Prohibition in the Text is further enforc'd; and ſome particular Inſtances of the contrary Practice related in Scripture. And

3. From the Senſe of Antiquity in the matter.

1*ſt*, From the Notion of Image-worſhip, as practic'd by the Heathens. And that the more ingenious amongſt them, (from whoſe Sentiments we are to form our Notions of their Worſhip, not from the Rabble) look'd upon their Images and Statues, as no other than Symbols, and Analogical Repreſentations of that Being, to which they paid Divine Worſhip, is ſo evident from thoſe accounts which Chriſtian Writers, no leſs than themſelves, give of their Images, and their Opinions concerning them, that no doubt but a *Julian*, *Celſus*, or a *Porphyry*, were they to write now, would publiſh their Complaints of *Miſrepreſentation*, as well as other People, and juſtify

their Practice upon the very ſame Grounds their Miſrepreſenters do theirs. *Nec ſimulacrum, nec Dæmonium colo*, ſays the *Heathen* in St. *Auſtin*, [in *Pſal.* 113.] *ſed per Effigiem corporalem ejus rei ſignum intueor, quam colere debeo.* And it appears from the Diſcourſe of *John* of *Theſſalonica*, recorded in the fifth Action of that Synod, which firſt eſtabliſh'd this hopeful way of Worſhip in *Chriſtendom*, that the Heathens at that time denied they worſhipped Images, but only the Spiritual Powers through them. Nay, farther, that the more Learned thinking parts of the *Gentile*-World, as the Schools of *Socrates* and *Plato* amongſt the *Greeks*, did worſhip one *true Supreme* God, by ſome of their Images; as likewiſe did the wiſer *Egyptians*, a rational and contemplative People, by theirs, is ſo largely, ſo learnedly evinc'd by an unanſwerable Writer of our own Church; that 'tis but manners his Labour ſhould ſuperſede any others upon this Argument, too copious to admit of any more than a bare mention here. I only therefore briefly Remark, without deſcending to Particulars, That if we will allow the wiſer Heathens to have had any Notions of one Supreme God, (and he muſt be a great Stranger, not only to theirs, but to Chriſtian Writers concerning them, who will not allow them to have had very noble and great ones) we muſt likewiſe grant that they worſhipped him in a meaſure proportionable to thoſe Notices and Conceptions they had of him. Agreeable hereunto the great Apoſtle, in the firſt Chapter of his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, ſpeaking of the Heathen Philoſophers, as *Chryſoſtom* obſerves, grants them not only to have known God, even *the Eternal Power and Godhead*, by Deductions from the Creatures; but likewiſe, to have *glorified* him in their Devotions, only indeed they did not glorify him as God, but in a way unſuitable to the infinite Perfections of his Nature, that is, as the Apoſtle explains himſelf in *v.* 23. by corporeal Images and Repreſentations.

of St. *ls.*

Thus

Thus again, The ſame Apoſtle in his Encounter with the Wits of *Athens*, *Acts* 17. taking it for granted they acknowledg'd one Supreme God, tho indeed they had not ſuch clear and diſtinct Conceptions of him, but that he was ſtill in a great meaſure *unknown* to them, as the Inſcription upon the Altar ſtiled him, plainly tells us, that they worſhipped him; for they worſhipped him whom he afterwards declar'd unto them, according to the Text; (*whom therefore ye ignorantly worſhip, him declare I unto you*) and he, I preſume, will be eaſily granted to have been the true God. Their only fault laid in the means or manner of their Worſhip, the Images graven by Art and mans Device, things ſo highly incongruous to the tranſcendent Perfections of his Nature, as the Apoſtle there argues. And what he has affirm'd of the *Greek* Philoſophers, *Plutarch* and others, who have writ concerning the *Egyptian* Worſhip, aſſert equally of them; and indeed, it ſeems highly abſurd, to imagine that they, who were ſo profoundly vers'd in the Books of the Creation, ſhould not in ſome meaſure ſpell out the great Creator by them, as well as other People. So that from the generality of this way of Worſhip *by* Images, and of the Supreme God by ſeveral of them, amongſt the *Egyptians* eſpecially, (whoſe way and notions of Worſhip muſt needs be ſuppos'd to have made a deep Impreſſion upon the minds of thoſe People to whom this Law was firſt given) we have good reaſon to conclude, That the Divine Wiſdom, which in the firſt Commandment forbad all falſe *Objects* of Worſhip, had in this ſecond a more peculiar regard to this corrupt *manner* of it.

But, 2*dly*, this Senſe of the Law will farther appear from thoſe Reaſons by which 'tis farther enforc'd, and ſome particular Inſtances of the contrary Practice related in Scripture. The reaſon urg'd by *Moſes*, in the Repetition of this Law, in the 4*th* of *Deuteronomy*, is, *that they*

they ſaw no manner of Similitude on the day that the Lord ſpake unto them in Horeb, out of the midſt of the Fire: Where I would only deſire to know, whether the force of that Reaſon be levell'd againſt making the Repreſentations of falſe Gods, or the true; unleſs indeed they will have him a falſe God who ſpake to the People out of the midſt of the Fire. The Argument offer'd againſt this Practice by the Evangelical Prophet, ſeems to go a little farther than that urg'd by *Moſes*, proceeding not upon the want of Countenance from God's non-appearance to them in any Similitude, but upon the intrinſick Abſurdity and Incongruity of the thing. *All Nations*, ſays he, *before him are as nothing, and they are counted to him as leſs than nothing, and vanity. To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeneſs will ye compare unto him?* [Iſa. 4. 17, &c.] Where I hope our Adverſaries will not be ſo abſurd, as to make an Argument againſt Worſhipping the true God by Repreſentations deriv'd from the incomprehenſible Majeſty of his Nature, a diſſwaſive only from the worſhip of Heathen Idols.

If from the Reaſons by which the Law is enforc'd, we deſcend to particular Inſtances of the Violation of it; they are ſo impregnable an evidence of the truth of what we aſſert, that 'tis next to an affront to an intelligent Audience to inſiſt upon them. For what Men in their Wits, but they who pretend to the faculty of making Gods themſelves, can imagine the *Jewiſh* High-Prieſt ſo abſurd, as to have deſign'd the Golden Calf for the true God of *Iſrael*, or the People to have worſhipp'd it as ſuch? Was *Aaron* indeed ſo Blaſphemouſly fond of the Work of his Hands, as to give that, and not rather the great Object deſign'd to be worſhipped by't, the incommunicable Name of *Jehovah*, as he does in the Proclamation of the Feaſt upon this occaſion? Or, did they take the Man *Moſes* for their God? For, for ought I ſee, they only deſired

ſired one in his Capacity, upon the occaſion of his Abſence, *Up, make us gods*; or as *Nehemiah* has it, *a God, which ſhall go before us*; *for, as for this Moſes, who went before us out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.* So that they either before took *Moſes* that living Symbol of the Divine Preſence amongſt them, for a God, or did not now take the Calf for one, but only for a Symbolical Repreſentation and Preſence of him, agreeable to the Worſhip of *Egypt*. Or, muſt we, laſtly, to ſhew that theſe *Jews* were worſe than other People, ſuppoſe them indeed ſo compleatly Sottiſh, as to have really taken the Calf for the God that brought them out of the Land of *Egypt*, even before it was made, whileſt the divine ſtupid thing lay yet ſcatter'd in the Ear-rings of its future Votaries? If from this Calf in the Wilderneſs, we paſs on to thoſe at *Dan* and *Bethel*, we find them likewiſe deſign'd for no other end, than viſible Symbols of the true God of *Iſrael*. *Jeroboam*, who ſet them up, never pretending an alteration in the Object, but only in the place of the Peoples worſhip; as is evident from hence, that the Sin of *Ahab* (who actually introduc'd the worſhip of a falſe God) is loaded with much greater Aggravations than this of *Jeroboam*; that the Worſhippers of *Ahab's* God, *Baal*, are mention'd in Contradiſtinction to thoſe who worſhip'd the Lord, [1 *Kings* 18. 21.] The generality whereof did at that time worſhip him by *Jeroboam's* Calves; That *Jehu* ſtiles his Zeal againſt the Worſhippers of *Baal*, a *zeal for the Lord*, *i. e.* the eſtabliſh'd Worſhip of the Kingdom at *Dan* and *Bethel* by the two Calves to which he adhered, [2 *Kings* 10. 16.] And indeed, *Jeroboam* muſt have been as much out of his Policticks, of which he was perfectly Maſter, as ſome Men are out of their Divinity, had he gone about to have ſecured the Revolt made to him, (the only end he deſign'd in the Change made of their Worſhip) by the Introduction of ſtrange Gods into it; that being the

the very cauſe for which, as *Abijah* had but juſt lately told him, the Divine Vengeance rent the Kingdom from *Solomon*, and gave it to him, his Servant, [1 *Kings* 11. 11, 31, 33.] and yet for all *Jeroboam*'s good Intentions of directing his Worſhip to a right ultimate Object, the God of *Iſrael*, by the Calves; we know what that God thought of him for it. Thus, laſtly, were the Graven and the Moltęn Images of *Micha*, in the 17*th* of *Judges*, *dedicated unto the Lord*, ſays the Text, to the worſhip of the only true God. As is farther evident from the Opinion he had, that the Lord would do him good for what he had done; eſpecially, ſince he had got a *Levite* to Officiate in his little private Oratory; which he had little reaſon to expect, if he worſhipp'd them either beſide, or in Oppoſition to that Lord from whom he expected the Bleſſing.

I ſhould now come to make out the ſame Senſe of this Commandment, from the third Medium I propos'd; The Sentiments of the Church in its pureſt Ages; ſhowing that the Fathers utterly condemn'd all manner of Images ſet up for Religious Worſhip, ſuch as reſpected God particularly, and not meerly thoſe of the Heathen World, on conſiderations peculiar to them; and this upon the ſtrength of the Prohibition in the Text, or other Places of the ſame import with it. But what I have ſaid, being ſufficient to give light to the true meaning of the Law, and the evincing of this Truth conſequent upon it, That in the Scripture-notion, a man may be guilty of Idolatry, who Worſhips a right ultimate Object *by* an Image; I muſt be content to diſmiſs this laſt Argument, becauſe it would require ſo juſt a Diſcourſe of it ſelf, that it cannot poſſibly be compriſed within the limits allotted to this.

I proceed to the ſecond thing I propos'd, The conſideration of the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome*, in

in relation to the Worſhip here prohibited; and becauſe an Image being made a *Medium* of Worſhip, becomes likewiſe an intermediate *Object* of it, the Original being worſhipped *in* and *by* that Worſhip, which is relatively given to the Images; and becauſe this will appear in the Sequel of this Diſcourſe, to be the true intent and meaning of the Church; I ſhall conſider their Doctrine and Practice under the term of *Image-worſhip*.

But cannot but juſtly complain, before I go any further, of the great inſincerity, that has of late been us'd in repreſenting their Doctrines to the World. If we'l believe the modern Palliators and Expoſitors, we have been upon a falſe Scent all this while; our Foreſathers, poor Men, either fondly or wilfully purſued the miſtaken Ideas of their own Imagination, inſtead of attending to the Intention of the Church; and there needs now no more than an innocent turn to the State of any Controverſy betwixt us, finally to decide it. So that in truth, we have more ado now, to know what their Doctrines are, than to refute them; as if they too, as well as their ſecret Diſciples, were for a time to go in diſguiſe amongſt us. Now, of all the Points in diſpute betwixt us and them, there has certainly none been more artificially dreſs'd up, than this concerning the Worſhip of Babies; as if Paint and Varniſh were as requiſite to the Doctrine, as the Subject of it. Our Eyes every day inform us, (if indeed we may truſt the Teſtimony of our Eyes) that they ſolemnly conſecrate them, carry them in Pomp and Proceſſion, ſet them up in their Churches, over their very Altars, places moſt proper for Religious Worſhip, kiſs them, proſtrate themſelves to 'em, burn Lights and Incenſe to their Honour; and yet they worſhip them! no, not they, honeſt Men, God forbid! They are only *Incentives* to their Devotion, *Remembrancers*

membrancers of their great Prototypes, and ſerve to fix their otherwiſe diſtracted Thoughts upon their right Objects. *So that to ſpeak preciſely, and according to the Eccleſiaſtical Stile, when they honour the Image of an Apoſtle or Martyr, their intention is not ſo much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apoſtle or Martyr in preſence of, or before the Image*, ſays the Biſhop of *Meaux*, in his Palliation of the Doctrine of Image-worſhip; and from him, the Repreſenter.

To wipe of which *Fucus*, I ſhall prove in the firſt place, That that which is given *before*, or in the preſence of Images, call it here what you will, has relation, or is given *to* Images, not only *before* them.

And ſecondly, becauſe the ſame Learned Prelate, and his unhappy Imitator, the Repreſenter, would again qualify the matter by the ſofter terms of *Honour*, *Reverence*, *Reſpect*, ſuch a *decent Regard* as is paid to holy things, and the like;

I ſhall ſhow in the ſecond Place, That, what is thus given *to* Images, is *Religious Worſhip*, properly ſo call'd.

1. Then, that what is given *before* Images, has relation, or is given *to* Images.

In order to the Proof whereof, I obſerve in the firſt place, that in the Scripture-ſtile, which we Hereticks think as good Argument as the *Eccleſiaſtick*, to fall down *before* Images, is as much as to fall down *to* them; and either of them, as much as to worſhip them. Thus *Amaziah*, in 2 *Chron.* 25. 14. is ſaid to have bow'd down himſelf, not *to*, but *before* the Gods of the Children of *Seir*, which the Angel of the Lord interpreted worſhipping of them; *for his anger was kindled againſt him for ſo doing*, v. 15. In 1 *Chron.* 17. 25. compared with 2 *Sam.* 7. 27. to Pray *before* God, and *to* God, are equivalent Expreſſions.

Expreſſions. And in the *New Teſtament*, the worſhip which the Devil requir'd our Saviour to give him, is expreſs'd in St. *Luke*, by worſhipping *before* him; ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιον μου, Chap. 4. ver. 7. And as the Scripture interprets ſuch Actions to be giving of worſhip *to* the thing *before* which they are done; ſo likewiſe, 'tis certain their Church intended no leſs. All their Divines unanimouſly, except two or three, who are cenſur'd grievouſly for it, are full to this purpoſe, and expreſly confute this Opinion as Heterodox, and almoſt Heretical. And why have they perplex'd the Chriſtian World ſo long, with the ſtudied Jargon of their Shifts and Diſtinctions, telling us, that the Honour, Worſhip, or whatever elſe you'l call it here, that they give them, is either *Subordinate*, *Tranſient*, *Relative*, or the like. For, in ſhort, 'tis none at all, under what Denomination ſoever, if Images are only a bare external Occaſion or Circumſtance of ſuch Honour or Worſhip, as this Palliation pretends. What need all the Scholaſtick Pudder and Noiſe about that ſort of *Latria*, as they are pleas'd to call it, which is given to Chriſt by Images, if the whole Myſtery amount to no more than giving it in their *Preſence*? For what ſhould hinder, why the moſt *abſolute* Divine Worſhip ſhould not be given him *before* them, only as they call him to mind, to whom all imaginable *Latria* is due? Accordingly *Bellarmin* and *Suarez*, diſcerning the neceſſary conſequences of this Opinion, as any Man might do, one would think, without the help of a Proſpective; declare, like honeſt Men, that it utterly vacates the whole State of the Controverſy; and that if this Notion takes place, the queſtion about the Worſhip of Images is at an end without farther diſpute, and ought abſolutely to be denied.

But becauſe all the Worthies of that Church hitherto, were only private, and the Biſhop of *Meaux*, perhaps a publick Doctor; I appeal in the ſecond Place, to that Council of *Nice*, which the *Trent* Divines confirm as Authentick; and there we find them ſtiled in one place, little better than mad; in another, half wicked, who affirm that Images are only to be retain'd for helps to Memory, and not for Worſhip or Salutation; and not to multiply Inſtances in a Caſe ſo notorious, they are roundly Anathematiz'd in the ſeventh Action of that Synod, who come not up to the buſineſs of their Worſhip; and for the ſake of common Senſe, why is the Notion of a relative Worſhip ſo frequently repeated and inculcated by the great Spokeſmen of that Senate, and inſiſted chiefly upon, as an healing Conſideration, in the very decree of the *Trent* Council upon the ſame Subject, if there had then been no more in the wind, than only worſhipping in the *Preſence* of an Image, as an occaſion of, and an incitement to that Duty? For as any Man's reaſon will inform him, this Notion of Relative Worſhip makes the Image an intermediate Object of Worſhip, tho the reaſon of ſuch Worſhip conſiſt not in the Image it ſelf, but in its Relation to the thing repreſented; and therefore I cannot but wonder what that Learned Prelate meant in his Appeal to the Decree of the Council of *Trent*, for the Confirmation of his Expoſition, unleſs he ſuppos'd that Hereticks had no Eyes in their Heads, which is all that's requiſite to refute him in this particular. For, beſides what I have juſt now ſaid, 'tis as palpable as words can make it that the Decree expreſly defines that Images are to be worſhipped, unleſs indeed, *debitum cultum & veneration em impertiri imaginibus*, be in a new Catholick Verſion to worſhip ſomething elſe *before* them.

Secondly,

Secondly, One would think it had been every whit as obvious for the Reverend Fathers of the Council, to have expreſs'd themſelves by *bonos qui* coram *imaginibus exhibetur*, as *qui eis exhibetur*, and to have framed the tenor of the whole Decree accordingly, if that had been their intention. And in the third and laſt place, I would only deſire to know, Whether or no it be the ſame thing to worſhip *before* Images, and *by* them, the one the Language of the Biſhop, the other of the Council; *itant per imagines*, ſay they; not *coram imaginibus, quas oſculamur*, and ſo forth. But any thing, it ſeems, rather than fail of making Converſions; and perhaps the more gilt the toys, the properer they are to wheedle the Children into the boſom of their Pretended Mother; and I heartily wiſh that Learned man joy of the honour of being the firſt who ever yet could make a Doctrine paſs for *Catholick*, againſt the almoſt entirely univerſal vote of the Writers of his own Communion, and the expreſs words of two of their Oecumenical Councils: An happy man he, indeed, who can ſtamp that Character upon a Doctrine, for the vending whereof two or three diſſenting Brethren amongſt them, whoſe Obſolete Opinion he has reviv'd, could hardly eſcape the Cenſure of Hereſie.

And thus much for the Proof of the Firſt Propoſition, That what is given *before* Images, has relation, or is given *to* them. I now come to prove in the Second Place, in oppoſition to a farther Palliation, reſpecting the Acts themſelves, ſtiling them only *Honour*, *Reverence*, *Reſpect*, or the like, That what is given to Images, is *Religious Worſhip*, properly and ſtrictly ſo called.

And the moſt natural way to do that, will be,

1. To explain what we mean by Religious Worſhip. And then,

2. To

2. To examine their allow'd Doctrine and Practice, in relation to what they give to Images. Whereby it will diſtinctly appear, Whether or no the latter fall within the Notion of the former, which is the queſtion.

Firſt then, I mean by Religious Worſhip, an awful acknowledgment of the Supreme Excellency, Power and Dominion of the Divinity over us, his tranſcendent Excellencies raiſing in us the moſt profound Honour for him, to which his Abſolute Power and Dominion ſuperadd the more formal Reaſon of Worſhip. Now man being a compound of Soul and Body, this acknowledgment muſt accordingly be twofold, *interior* of the one, and *exterior* of the other; the latter being not only a ſign and indication of, but naturally conſequent upon the former, and as abſolutely requiſite, as is the publick external exerciſe of Religion, the greater advancement of God's Glory, and the acknowledgment of his ſuperiority over one part of us as well as another; it being neceſſary, if for no other reaſon, to glorifie God in our Bodies as well as Spirits, becauſe they are both God's; and an unanſwerable argument, that *external* actions muſt bear a part in the due performance of Religious Worſhip, is this, That otherwiſe we could never be certain of any falſe Worſhip in the World, ſince the internal actions of the mind do not fall of themſelves within human cognizance: As to the former part of this Worſhip, the internal veneration and ſubmiſſion of our Souls, there is no doubt at all, but that he who gives that to Creatures, or any Images of them, gives them Religious Worſhip with a witneſs; the only difficulty lies in the external actions of the Body, as Bowing of the Head, Genuflexion, &c. which being capable of different *Conſtructions*, *Civil* as well as *Religious*, the main point of our

our preſent enquiry, muſt be how to know when ſuch actions become of a *Religious ſignification*; for when they do ſo, they become acts of *external Adoration*, which the common notions of mankind, ever ſince the world began, have determin'd to be parts of Religious Worſhip: And whence, I pray, ſhould ſuch actions take the particular denomination of *Religious*, but from what Phyſical Actions receive any other appellations; and that is either poſitive appropriation to ſuch an uſe, or from the Circumſtances of Time, Place, Occaſion, Object, and the like, as well as intention of him that does them? Thus, for inſtance, acts of Sacrifice and Incenſe, become acts of Religious Worſhip, becauſe God appropriated them to his Service. Thus the Proſtration which the Devil requir'd of our Saviour, was by him interpreted Religious Worſhip, becauſe the occaſion was argument enough that he could demand no other. Thus tho a man may kneel, bow his head, or incline his body to his Friend, his Father, or his King, and ſtill keep within the bounds of Civil Decency and Decorum; yet if he ſhould uſe the Solemn Rites appointed for a Religious Performance, conſecrate his friend, place him not only in the Church, but upon the Altar; and at the ſet times of Prayer, there pay the ſame external acts of reſpect to him, no man would ſtick to pronounce them religious, from the natural notions we have of ſuch actions, ſo circumſtanciated; accordingly we find *St. Auſtin* in one place inſiſting upon the particular circumſtance of placing their Statues over the Altar, to prove that the Heathens, conſtructively, took them for Gods, *i. e.* gave them Divine Worſhip. *Quod numen habeant, & pro numine accipiant, illam ſtatuam ara teſtatur*, &c. *Nemo nobis dicat, non eſt Deus, non eſt numen* (for it ſeems they ſtood upon the goodneſs of their Intentions too) *utinam ipſi*

ſic norint, ſays he, *quomodo nos novimus, ſed quid habeant, pro quâ re habeant ara teſtatur.* Thus again when S. *John* in an Extacy fell down at the Feet of the Angel, that action likewiſe came under the notion of Religious Worſhip (which he bid him therefore give to God) becauſe the Angel, the Object to which it was done, was of a nature Superior in Power and Perfection to his own. For ſuch reſpects, proceeding not from any civil Relations to ſuch beings, of which they are not capable, but from a ſtrange awful Apprehenſion of ſome ſecret Power and Superiority they have over us; they partake of the formal Reaſon of the Worſhip of God himſelf, and muſt therefore be look'd upon as Religious. Upon the ſame ground, doubtleſs, did St. *Peter* interpret the Worſhip *Cornelius* gave him to be *Religious*; from the extraordinary Sentiments which he ſaw he had of his Perſon, as of one above the Power and Perfection of humane Nature; as ſufficiently appears from the Apoſtles bidding him ſtand up, for that he alſo was a man, [*Acts* 10.] And thus all mankind naturally judg of ſuch Actions without the leaſt Heſitancy or Demur, tho perhaps they never ſtate the Point, unleſs upon occaſion, nor attend to the reaſons why they do ſo. And what has been ſaid of ſuch Actions in relation to animate Beings, will for the very ſame reaſons hold good of them, when performed with regard to the Images of ſuch Beings; beſides, that the Worſhip of the Images being referr'd to the thing repreſented, it muſt of neceſſity be the ſame, and not a different kind of Worſhip.

Thus much then for the Explication of the term of Religious Worſhip. The next and moſt natural advance now is, to examine whether or no, by the Authentick Doctrine, and the beſt authorized Practice

of

of the Church of *Rome*, any ſuch Worſhip given to Images.

And firſt, I ſhall examine them in relation to the firſt and principal part of it, the internal Veneration and Submiſſion of the mind. This, I preſume, being the moſt conſiderable Part of that worſhip they are pleas'd to call *Latria*; for that, as the ſecond Council of *Nice* deſcribes it, is done, τῇ διανοίᾳ and ὁ πνεύματι, in the Spirit or Mind.

That St. *Thomas*, as the Phraſe is, and his numerous Adherents determin'd the worſhip of *Latria*, and conſequently the moſt interior Devotion of the mind, to be given to the Images of Chriſt, is notoriouſly known; and yet St. *Thomas* may vye with any Biſhop in *Europe*, in Approbations from *Rome*; witneſs the Elogies and noble Teſtimonies concerning him and his Doctrine, by *John* the 22*d* who Canoniz'd him; by *Paul* the 5*th*, *Innocent* the 6*th*, *Clement* the 8*th*, *Urban* the 5*th*, *Pius* 5*th*, in their ſeveral Bulls, or other Diſcourſes relating to this Saint. But becauſe Teſtimonials ſignify nothing, perhaps, when urg'd the wrong way, and that reaſon is altogether as ſatisfactory to thoſe they call Hereticks, as a naked Authority; I ſhall ſhow, That this Opinion of *Aquinas* is undeniably conſequent, both upon the Doctrine and Practice of their Church.

Firſt, Upon the Doctrine. The reaſon aſſign'd for the Worſhip of Images in the Council of *Trent*, is, Becauſe the Honour which is exhibited to them, is *refer'd*, or, as the ſecond Council of *Nice* more clearly expreſſes it, does διαβαίνειν, paſs on, or go through, to the Prototypes which they repreſent. Now, ſays *Aquinas*, who quotes this Reaſon from *Damaſus*, the

Worſhip that is given to the Prototype, Chriſt himſelf, is certainly *latria*, and conſequently ſo muſt that be too which is given to his Image; for otherwiſe how can the Worſhip be ſaid to be return'd to, or paſs on, from the *One* to the *Other*, if it be not the ſame, but a different ſort of Worſhip?

A Reaſoning this, as old at the ſecond Council of *Nice* it ſelf, where it is urg'd, without the leaſt Contradiction, by *John* the Vicar of the Oriental Biſhops; and they may refute it at their leiſure, unleſs, by a modern ſort of Logick, it be Anſwer ſufficient to diſavow a *Conſequence* evidently deduc'd from *Principles* allow'd, *i. e.* to *hold faſt* the *Premiſſes*, and yet deny the *Concluſion*.

But, *ſecondly*, this Doctrine of *Aquinas* is moſt undeniably conſequent upon the Practice of the Church, the beſt Comment upon her Doctrine; and that in relation, particularly, to the Images of the Croſs; where I ſhall need only barely to relate the Prayers addreſſed to them, and then leave any man to judge whether or no the great Doctor of the Schools, and his Followers, who expreſly found their Opinion thereupon, concerning the *latria* that is to be given them, did not argue like Men of both true Sincerity and Logick which were to be deſir'd in later Writers of that Communion. In their *Breviary* then, of as good Authority as the Council of *Trent* could make it, by whoſe Order it was reſtored, we find this Hymn to the Croſs: *Arbor decora & fulgida* (for I'll repeat the words in their own Language, for fear of Miſrepreſentation) *ornata Regis purpurâ, electa digno ſtipite, tam ſancta Membra tangere. O* Crux *ave ſpes unica, in hoc Paſchali gaudio, auge piis juſtitiam reiſque dona veniam.* To which the *Antiphona* ſubjoyns: *O* Crux *ſplendidior cunctis aſtris, mundo celebris, hominibus multum amabilis, ſanctior univerſis, quæ ſola fuiſti digna portare*

talentum

talentum mundi, dulce lignum, *dulces clavos*, *dulcia ferens* pondera, *salva presentem catervam, in tuis bodie laudibus congregatam.* Where the *Crux*, the *Arbor decora, electa digno stipite*, and the *dulce lignum*, to which these notable Petitions are addressed, are so expressly distinguish'd from the *sancta membra*, the *talentum mundi*, and *dulcia pondera*, which they bore upon them, that 'tis not in the power of all the Figures in Rhetorick to construe them as put up to Christ himself, unless Christ may be stil'd the *Cross*, the *Tree*, the *Wood*, chosen of a *worthy Trunk*, as well as the Person that hung upon it. And, but to add one word more; The Rubrick in the Pontifical, determining the manner of Procession at the Reception of the Emperour, orders the Cross of the Legate to have the Right-hand, *quia debetur ei latria*, without any distinction, or farther explication of the term.

If to what I have prov'd from Authorities very little inferiour to a positive Decree of Council, be oppos'd the silence of the *Trent*-Fathers in the matter, (and I see nothing else at present that can be objected:) I answer;

First, That their silence in a Point which they ought to have condemn'd, had they disliked, ought certainly to pass for a tacite Approbation. *Secondly*, That I have already made it appear from the Reason of *Image Worship* assign'd in the very Decree of the Council, that the Images of Christ are to be worship'd with *latria*, the most proper Divine Worship imaginable. *Thirdly*, That they still retain'd those Prayers and Hymns to the Cross, which the best Heads of that Communion grounded their Opinions upon, as is evident from the *Breviary* restored by their Order, publish'd and revis'd since by

several of their Popes. And *fourthly* and *lastly*, That the Council plainly enough countenances this Doctrine, as well as any other; for, defining only in general, That *due Worship and Veneration* is to be given them, any man certainly may give the Images of Christ, and the Cross, the Worship of *latria*, who thinks it their *due*; especially when back'd with the Practice of the Church, the best Expositor of what the Council meant by their *due Worship*.

And thus much in proof, That the internal Veneration of the Mind is paid to Images. After which, it will be no hard matter to prove, that the acts of external Adoration are perform'd to them likewise, tho upon the account of their relation to their Originals, which alters not the *Object*, but only the *Reason* of such Worship. And for this I might appeal, not only to the Epistle of *Tarasius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople* at the time of the second *Nicene* Council, to *Constantine* and *Irene*, besides infinite other places, but to the very Definition of that Council in the seventh Action, where they are anathematiz'd who deny it. I only observe, that the word by which the Council expresses such Worship, is, προσκύνησις, the same whereby the Holy Ghost stil'd that which the Devil requir'd of our Saviour; which *Tarasius*, in the forementioned Epistle, explains by the exterior actions of Kissing, Bowing, Prostration, &c. the internal signification of which Actions he there affirms to be improv'd and augmented by the addition of the Preposition πρὸς, to the obsolete *Greek* word κυνῶ; to all which that Council adds, in its very Definition, the burning of Lights and Incense. As for the Synod of *Trent*, which confirms it, the Fathers there expressly decree the exterior acts of Adoration to be done to Images.

The

The *Trent*-Catechiſm tells us they are plac'd in the Church *ut colantur*, that they may be worſhip'd. The Pontifical informs us, That in the Benediction of a new Croſs, the Prieſt, *flexis ante crucem genibus, ipſam devotè adorat & oſculatur.* The Choir ſings, upon a *Good-Friday*, upon uncovering the Croſs to the People, *Venite adoremus*; which they accordingly perform, by Proſtration, and ſuch-like Actions. The Head of the Church himſelf, good Man, on that day goes between two Cardinals, *ad adorandum*, to adore the Croſs, ſays the Ceremonial, bowing himſelf in great humility to it. Now all theſe exterior actions being perform'd with all the Formalities, Occaſions, Circumſtances and Solemnities, which the common ſenſe of Mankind pronounces ſufficient to denominate them Religious; as, at ſet Times of Religious Worſhip, fix'd Places of it, in Temples and before Altars, with burning of Lights, oblation of Incenſe, and with Intention of worſhiping the Image thereby, (for otherwiſe 'tis all but Mockery and Grimace, as ſeveral of their own Authors irrefragably argue, and a Man only plays the fool with an *Image*, for the ſake of its *Original*;) ſuch Actions, I ſay, muſt therefore inevitably fall under the Notion of Religious Adoration, a neceſſary part of Religious Worſhip, and conſequently Religious Worſhip, as it relates to the actions of both Body and Mind, is given to Images themſelves in the Church of *Rome*.

But becauſe theſe Men have ſought out many Inventions to vacate rather the force of this Law, than totally to recede from a Doctrine and Practice repugnant to it, when once decreed by Infallible Church: let us, in the laſt place, briefly examine how they qualifie the matter, and palliate the Cure which they reſolve not to perfect.

And

And *firſt*, as to the Images of the Trinity, which he muſt be a very bold man who affirms it unlawful either to make or to worſhip in the Church of *Rome*; they tell us, That they are not intended for Repreſentations of the *Divine Nature* as it is in it ſelf, but only of the *Appearances* of the *Divine Perſons*; as of our Saviour in an Humane Form, of the Holy Ghoſt in the Shape of a Dove, *&c.*

To which 'tis anſwer'd briefly, *firſt*, That unleſs they can ſhow how any thing can be repreſented otherwiſe than according to its Appearances, or that an Heathen *Phidias*, *Apelles*, or others, ever ſet up for carving or painting Natures and Souls, Inviſibilities, Abſtractions, and Eſſences, this diſtinction muſt be vain and inſignificant; and juſt as if a Prince, having made it Treaſon by an expreſs Law to draw his Picture, a Criminal ſhould think to come off by alledging that he drew indeed his Face and his Body, but not his Soul, or his reaſonable Nature *Secondly*, I ſay, That God having prohibited all Repreſentations of himſelf whatſoever, whether they be likeneſſes of *things in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Water under the Earth*; he has conſequently forbid all Repreſentations of his Appearances; for they muſt be in the Likeneſs of ſome of the things before mentioned. And *thirdly*, I ask upon what grounds the Repreſentations of ſuch Appearances, as that of an *Old Man* for God the Father, and of a *Dove* for God the Holy Ghoſt, which are meer Repreſentations of Creatures not perſonally united to the Godhead, not even during ſuch Appearances, much leſs in their Repreſentations, come to be the Object of Religious Worſhip.

Others

Others therefore among them, upon theſe, or the like Conſiderations, being infinitely ſcandaliz'd, as well they may, at this horrible Practice, yet think themſelves without the reach of the Prohibition of this Law, in worſhiping Chriſt by an Image, ſince the actual hypoſtatical Union of the Humane to the Divine Nature in him, here upon Earth.

But that this is by no means ſufficient to juſtifie the Worſhip of Chriſt by a Repreſentation of an Humane Form, will appear from this ſingle Conſideration, That he being the proper Object of our Worſhip, upon the account of his *Godhead* only, that Law which forbids Men to worſhip *God* by any Images or Figures of him, muſt likewiſe forbid them to worſhip Chriſt ſo too, who is *God*. Had indeed the aſſuming of our Nature contributed any thing towards the Glory of the Divine, thereby founding, as it were, a farther *Reaſon* of Worſhip, there might then have been ſome ſpecious Colour for worſhiping him ſtill by Repreſentations of it: But ſince this form of a Servant was ſo far from being a freſh acceſſion to, that it was the very emptying himſelf of his Glory, it muſt needs be very prepoſtrous and abſurd to think of honouring him by that, much more by the dead ſenſeleſs Figure of the very exterior Lineaments of that, not capable of any Union with him, which he thought ſo infinitely debaſing of his Nature, whilſt, for our ſakes, he bore it about him.

A third Colour by which they would render this Practice plauſible, are thoſe words in the *Trent* Decree, which forbid us to believe *any Divinity or Virtue in Images for which they ought to be worſhipped, to demand any favour of them, or put any truſt in them, as the* Gentiles *did*. Which words, ſays the Biſhop of *Meaux*, are ſo many Characters to diſtinguiſh them from Idolaters.

To

To which I return, *firſt*, That the Prohibition in the Law extending to all manner of Images without exception, or diſtinction of ſuch as are believ'd to have Virtue and Divinity in them, and ſuch as are not; we expect better Reaſon than any yet offer'd for reſtraining the Prohibition to any particular kind of them. *Secondly*, I abſolutely deny that the Heathens, unleſs the very Beaſts of the People, (and thoſe may find Parallels enough in our oppoſite Communion) had ſuch groſs and ſottiſh Conceptions of their Images, as the Council and their Writers would fix upon them; as has been touch'd upon before, and is ſo clearly made out by ſeveral good hands already, that I might ſafely omit it, had I time to inſiſt upon it here. All the Virtue and Divinity that they thought lodg'd in them, if we will believe their own Teſtimony in *Arnobius*, was only ſuch as they conceiv'd did derive from their Conſecration to ſuch an Uſe. Wherein, I ſay, *thirdly*, the *Romaniſts* ſeem equally guilty. Witneſs the many notable Miracles, reported of their Images, by no leſs Authority than that of the wiſe Fathers of the ſecond *Nicene* Council. Witneſs the known Practice of Pilgrimages to *ſome* of them, rather than to others. Witneſs ſeveral of their own Authors, who aſſure us, That Chriſt himſelf is moſt truly believ'd to be preſent in them after a particular manner. Witneſs, *laſtly*, what is unqueſtionable Authority, the Prayers extant in the *Pontifical* and *Ceremonial*, us'd to this day in the Benediction of the Images of the Croſs, and the Conſecration of *Agnus Dei's*: As that, particularly, to omit ſeveral others, wherein the Prieſt prays, That the very *Lignum Crucis*, the Wood of the Croſs which he dedicates, on purpoſe as it were to bar all Figures in the Conſtruction, may be a wholſom Remedy to Mankind, a ſtreng-

a ſtrengthning of Faith, a Comfort, Protection, and Safeguard againſt the cruel Darts of the Enemy, &c.

In the Conſecration of thoſe Divine Baubles, *Agnus Dei's*, the Head of the Church himſelf, to make ſure of the buſineſs, prays, That they may receive Vertue, *ut virtutem accipiant*, againſt all the Wiles of the Devil, Tempeſts, Peſtilences, Adverſities, Falling ſickneſs, Fires, Miſcarriages in Women, Iniquities, and what not? and that they, who carry them about them, and *worſhip* them, adds another Prayer, may partake of the Benefits of thoſe great and tranſcendent Virtues they are endow'd with. After which I deſire only to know, *firſt*, Whether or no we may not very rationally preſume, that ſuch Virtues as thoſe come in for a ſhare of the Reaſon of that Worſhip which is given to ſuch Images of the Croſs and *Agnus Dei's*, after Conſecration? And *ſecondly*, Whether or no the Biſhop of *Meaux* has repreſented their Doctrine with that Sincerity and good Faith which might become a Perſon of his Character and Undertaking, when he tells us, that they attribute no other *Virtue* to Images, but that of exciting in them the remembrance of thoſe they repreſent.

The *fourth* and *laſt Aſylum* they fly to, is the diſtinction of Worſhip into *inferior* and *relative*, given to Images; and *Sovereign* and *Abſolute*, terminated upon their Originals.

Now that theſe terms, how plauſible ſoever, can have no place in the preſent buſineſs of Divine Worſhip, will appear from the conſideration of the reaſon why they came to be uſed, and that was their congruity indeed to the nature of Civil Honours and Reſpects, from whence they came, but very illogically, to be applied to the acts of Religious Worſhip, different in the whole Species from them. The reaſon of Civil Honours are Civil Excellen-

cies; and the reason of the different degrees of them, the different Excellencies, orders, Stations, and Capacities of Men who are their Object, which may therefore be given to them in different measures, and by different methods.

But now the proper Reason of Religious Worship being the Supreme Soveraignty and Power of Almighty God, and that being utterly incommunicable to a Creature, which is infinitely distant in its whole nature and kind, how excellent soever it be, neither can any part or parcel of Divine Worship which is founded thereupon, in any respect whatsoever be given to any thing besides himself; and therefore tho I may, for instance, give *inferior* degrees of civil respect to a Subject, without intrenching upon the Honour due to a King, because they are both of the same *kind* of *Beings*, to which civil respects belong, differing not specifically in their Natures, but politick Capacities only; yet cannot I therefore give an *inferior* degree of Religious Worship to a Creature, much less to its Image, or any Image of God, which is a Creature still, because it is different in the *whole kind* from him, as different only as Finite is from Infinite, and does not in the least partake of the *reason* of such worship. And therefore, again, tho I may Honour my Prince, as the Representer argues, by *relatively* honouring his Image for his sake, because my Prince has not forbid it, and is a Being of such a Nature as to admit of a Representation, and of Honour by it; yet cannot I therefore worship God by an Image, not only by reason of the natural incapacity of the object, as before; but because he has expressly prohibited such Worship: and as a Reason thereof, has been pleas'd to acquaint us, that He's a Being of such a Glorious and In-

Infinite Nature, as neither can be repreſented, nor receive any honour by Graven Images.

Agreeable to what has been ſaid, we may obſerve that the Law now before us prohibits the *loweſt* ſort of worſhip that we can poſſibly beſtow on them, the external acts of bowing down to them, and the like, as the Text words it; and that in a *relative* ſenſe too, it being the ſcope and intent of the Commandment to prohibit the Worſhip of God *by* them, as we have before evinc'd. Thus likewiſe the worſhip which the Devil requir'd of our bleſſed Lord, was no more than the bare *exterior* act of *falling down*, not only *to*, but *before* Him, as we have before already obſerv'd out of St. *Luke*, which yet our Saviour denied him; and that not upon conſiderations peculiar to that infernal Spirit, but for ſuch a Reaſon as will hold againſt any other Creature, and much more its Image: becauſe God, the Great God, was the only true and adequate Object of what he requir'd. Accordingly we find the Fathers frequently inſiſting upon theſe two places now alledged, as utterly irreconcileable with all uſe of Images in the buſineſs of Divine Worſhip; and indeed had they once broke in upon theſe comprehenſive Precepts, as comprehenſive as words can make them, by Salvo's and Diſtinctions, the traſh and refuſe of School-Divinity, it cannot well be imagined how they could have oppugn'd the Heathen Philoſophers in this particular, who generally acknowledging one ſupreme God, gave only a *relative* and *inferior* worſhip to all created Beings, and images of them, as they themſelves abundantly teſtify; or how they could have eſcaped the ſame condemnation with the Heathen world in general, who owning ſeveral *inferior* Deities, could, conſequently give them, and their images, or rather them *by* their images, no more than an inferior worſhip.

How could they, if the buſineſs of relative Worſhip had then been thought ſufficient to excuſe from Idolatry, even where the ultimate Object is right, have condemn'd the *Gnoſtics* of it, who terminated the worſhip they gave to Images of Chriſt upon Chriſt himſelf, as is on all hands confeſſed? How could they, again, admitting this diſtinction, ſo unanimouſly have pronounc'd the *Arrians* Idolaters, for worſhipping Chriſt under the notion of a Creature, notwithſtanding thoſe Hereticks alledg'd they worſhiped Him only as the Image of God the Father, upon whom they *ultimately terminated* the the worſhip which they *relatively* gave to him? So repugnant are their diſtinctions with the comprehenſive Precepts of God, in relation to his Worſhip, and the ſenſe of the pureſt Antiquity, the beſt Rules we have to walk by.

I might farther, in the laſt place, evidently diſplay the utter inconſiſtency of one diſtinction, and of one Doctor's Opinion, with another in this matter, but that the time will not give me leave; and therefore I ſhall content my ſelf, to ſhut up this Argument with this brief Reflection, That the repugnancies amongſt them, and the almoſt unintelligible ſubtilties they are driven to in defence of their reſpective Doctrines upon this ſubject are, upon the whole, to any unprejudic'd perſon, a ſtrong indication of a deſperate cauſe.

And now is it not an amazing conſideration, to find the worſhip of thoſe things grown up into an Article of our Chriſtian Faith, and a condition of Salvation it ſelf, which ſome of the ableſt Writers of the pureſt Ages of the Church, ſuch as *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, *Origen* and *Tertullian* thought it unlawful for a Chriſtian even to make, which the Fathers of thoſe and after-times generall thought improper, at leaſt, for the Churches of God;

God; which were afterwards introduc'd into thoſe ſacred places, upon the unhappy ſuppoſition they would prove proper motives to draw the Gentile world, who had been us'd to them, to their Aſſemblies, and the Chriſtian Profeſſion; and were of no other than ornamental and hiſtorical uſe there; which, when began firſt to be worſhip'd, had no other Votaries than the ignorant and ſuperſtitious; and which no part of the whole Chriſtian Church ever made any object of Religious adoration for Seven hundred eighty ſeven years together; a Doctrine, nouriſh'd in its growth, by notorious Treaſon and Rebellion, advanc'd and confirm'd by trifling Reaſonings, frivolous or falſe Quotations, fabulous Stories, lying Miracles, and all that idle traſh extant, God be thank'd, at this day in that glorious Council of *Nice*, which firſt eſtabliſh'd Baby-worſhip by a Law; a Doctrine and Practice that originally deriv'd from Gentile ſuperſtition; remains an everlaſting obſtruction to the Converſion of the *Jew*; is without the leaſt countenance from the written VVord of God, in the confeſſion of our Adverſaries themſelves; the very Council of *Nice*, the great *Aquinas*, *Suarez*, and others, founding it only upon that hopeful Baſis of I know not what Tradition: A Practice, laſtly, not only beſides the Rule of our Religion, but particularly repugnant to the Nature and Genius of the worſhip it requires, a worſhip in Spirit and Truth, that would be perform'd with as deep an abſtraction from ſenſe, as the complex'd condition of humanity will admit; a worſhip that ought to aſcend to its great object above, in ſteddy and direct rays of fervour and devotion, without the leaſt refraction from ſenſible intermediate Objects, which clog, retard, and frequently cut ſhort its flight in any ones experience, who attends to the Actions of his own mind in this particular.

And

And therefore, are Images ſo far from being any aſſiſtance to us in our Devotions, as is pretended,

That firſt, as to the Vulgar, the far greateſt Part every where, and who carry no diſtinctions to Church with them, they inevitably plunge them into the Commiſſion of the moſt craſs and profound Idolatry; as has been frequently and ſadly complain'd of by ſeveral ſober Writers of that Communion; and is, at this day, a moſt deplorable Spectacle in thoſe Countries, where theſe dumb Inſtructors of the Ignorant, as they would have them thought, abound in greateſt numbers. No nor

Secondly, Can the Devotion of the moſt intelligent abſtracting Perſons eſcape conſiderable Corruption and Alloy by this way of Worſhip; which I think demonſtrable from hence, That the wiſeſt Men being made up of Soul and Body, as well as the reſt, and the Operations of one part being in every ones experience limited and depreſs'd by the weight and contrary tendency of the other viſible Objects do in ſpite of our ſelves, moſt ſenſibly affect us; and conſequently, a viſible Repreſentation of an inviſible Object, ſuppos'd too to bear ſome Analogy to its Original, actually courting our Senſes in the Duties of Devotion, which of all our Actions ought to be the moſt purely ſpiritual and refined, will, by inſenſible advances, work its ſelf into an internal Reſpect and Veneration in the minds of its Votaries, will *tye down* the beſt of their Devotions to the Object of their Eyes, and gradually engroſs a greater ſhare in them, than the thing repreſented. For a further Confirmation whereof, I deſire only, with St. *Auſtin*, to appeal to the Obſervation and Conſcience of any, who ever repeats the Experiment. *Quis adorat, vel orat intuens ſimulacrum, qui non ſic affi-*

citur

citur, ut ab eo ſe exaudiri putet, ac ab eo ſibi præſtari quod deſiderat ſperet, [in *Pſ.* 113.] And therefore, Men may talk of their Intentions in the performance of ſuch Actions as long as they pleaſe; God, who knows what is in Man, better than he himſelf is acquainted with the utmoſt ſtretch and extent of his Faculties, Judges thus of them, and ſo indeed, will any Man too who attentively reflects upon them himſelf. Thus, for inſtance, does the Divine Wiſdom tell us, That he who commits any known Sin, caſts his Laws behind him, ſays in his heart, God ſees it not, or that the God of *Iſrael* doth not regard it, and the like, tho no Man perhaps ever actually intended, or thought of any ſuch thing at the time of the Commiſſion of his Sin, and would be ready to deny the Juſtice of the Imputation; which yet, upon Examination, appears undeniably true, every ſuch Sin implying a proportionable degree of Atheiſm, as the Divine Wiſdom interprets it. Let us therefore make his declared Will, not our fooliſh Intentions, the Rule and Standard of his Worſhip; and why ſhould it not be the meaſure of that, as well as of our Obedience to any other of his Commands? Let us in a word, heartily bleſs God for the Reformation of our Church, from the Fopperies and Idolatrous Practices of the *Romiſh* Communion; and never through Fear, Cowardice, Levity of Mind, Temporizing Coldneſs and Indifferency, Intereſt, or any other Motive, unworthy of a Man, Chriſtian, or Proteſtant, deſert our excellent and eſtabliſh'd Profeſſion, till we find another more Orthodox in her Doctrine, or more pure and decent in her Worſhip; and then who knows how ſoon God may ariſe, and have Mercy upon our *Sion*; for it is time, O Lord, that thou have Mercy upon Her, yea, the time is come.

FINIS.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiſwell.

DR. *Patricks* Parable of the Pilgrim. The *6th* Edition Corrected.

—— Expoſition of the Ten Commandments. 8vo.

—— Private Prayer to be uſed in difficult times.

— Sermon before the Prince of *Orange* at St. *James's*, *20th January*, 1688.

—— Sermon before the Queen at *Whitehall*, *March* 1. 1688.

Dr. *Burnets* Collection of Tracts and Diſcourſes, written after the Diſcovery of the Popiſh Plot, from the years 1678, to 1685. To which is added, A Letter written to Dr *Burnet*, giving an Account of Cardinal *Pools* Secret Powers. The Hiſtory of the Powder Treaſon, with a Vindication of the Proceedings thereupon. An Impartial Conſideration of the Five Jeſuits Dying Speeches, who were executed for the Popiſh Plot, 1679.

—— His Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of *England*: In which is demonſtrated, that all the Eſſentials of Ordination, according to the Practice of the Primitive and Greek Churches, are ſtill retained in our Church.

—— Reflections on the Relation of the Engliſh Reformation, lately Printed at *Oxford*. In two Parts 4to.

—— Animadverſions on the Reflections upon Dr. *BURNET's* Travels. 8o.

—— Reflections on a Paper, intituled his Majeſties Reaſons for withdrawing himſelf from *Rocheſter*.

—— An Enquiry into the Preſent State of Affairs, and in particular, whether we owe Allegiance to the King in theſe Circumſtances? And whether we are bound to Treat with Him, and call him back or no?

—— A Sermon Preached in St *James's* Chappel before the Prince of *Orange* 23*d*. *December*, 1688.

—— A Sermon Preached before the Houſe of Commons, 31. *January*, 1688. being the Thankſgiving day for the Deliverance of this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power.

—— His Eighteen Papers relating to the Affairs of Church and State, during the Reign of King *James* the Second. Seventeen whereof were written in *Holland*, and firſt Printed there; the other at *Exeter*, ſoon after the Prince of *Orange's* Landing in *England*.

—— A Letter to Mr. *Thevenot*, Containing a Cenſure of Mr. *Le Grand's* Hiſtory of King *Henry* the *Eighth's* Divorce. To which is added, a Cenſure of Mr. *de Meaux's* Hiſtory of the Variations of the Proteſtant Churches. Together with ſome further Reflections on Mr. *Le Grand*. 1689.

Scriptorum Eccleſiaſticorum Hiſtoria Literaria a Chriſte nato uſque ad Saeculum XIV. *Facili Methodo digeſta. Qua de Vita illorum ac Rebus geſtis, de Secta, Dogmatibus, Elogio, Stylo; de Scriptis genuinis, dubiis, ſuppoſititiis, ineditis, deperditis, Fragmentis; deque variis Operum Editionibus perſpicue agitur. Accedunt Scriptores Gentiles, Chriſtianae Religionis Oppugnatores; & cujuſvis Saeculi Breviarium. Inſeruntur ſuis locis Veterum aliquot Opuſcula & Fragmenta, tum Graeca, tum Latina, hactenus inedita. Praemiſſa denique Prolegomena, quibus plurima ad Antiquitatis Eccleſiaſticae ſtudium ſpectantia traduntur.* Opus Indicibus neceſſariis inſtructum. Autore *GULIELMO CAVE*, SS. *Theol. Profeſ. Canonico Windeſorienſi. Accedit ab Alia Manu Appendix ab ineunte Saeculo* XIV. *ad Annum uſque* MDXVII. *Fol.* 1689.

IMPRIMATUR,

Hen. Maurice, R.mi Patri ac D.ni Willhelmo Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi a Sacris.

Novemb. 5. 1685.

XUM